

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Who are you 'serving' when you set out to broadcast such and 'unfair and unbalanced news'? How, on the other hand, can you call 'news' the anti-Kerry movie 'stolen honor'? Who is stealing from whom? I am afraid, it is Sinclair who's stealing the truth by choosing to present what is described (no, sirs, I have not seen the program) as a very biased movie with no other purpose than to manipulate the voters. Please, refer to the Frontline program aired (TV and Radio) last week. THAT is a fair and balanced portrait of the candidates.

Respectfully,

Eliana Vasquez